



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,039	08/21/2003	James Michael McArdle	AUS920030607US1	7333
35525	7590	03/31/2009		
IBM CORP (YA)				
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC				
P.O. BOX 802333				
DALLAS, TX 75380				
EXAMINER				
SYED, FARHAN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2165				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/31/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeciipaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,039

Applicant(s)

MCARDLE, JAMES MICHAEL

Examiner

FARHAN M. SYED

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 7, 8, 16 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 7, 8, 16 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 16, and 19 are pending. The Examiner acknowledges cancelled claims 3-6, 9-15, 17-18 and 20 and amended claims 1, 2, 8, 16, and 19.

Response to Remarks/Argument

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 17 December 2008, with respect to claims 11 and 12 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Because Applicant cancelled claims 11 and 12, the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection to these claims are moot.
3. In Applicant's arguments, filed supra, Applicant failed to address the objection to claim 16, in the Non-Final Office Action, mailed 17 September 2008. Therefore, the Examiner will maintain objection to claim 16.
4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 7-8, 16, and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Examiner's rejections of the claims, now set forth are in light of the applicant's arguments against the art applied, as necessitated by amendment, but applied in the modified position therefore, the arguments are deemed moot.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the computer program product" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 11-12, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Google Language Tool (known hereinafter as Google)(previously presented) in view of Drissi et al (U.S. Patent 6,952,691 and known hereinafter as Drissi)(previously presented) and in further view of Bennett et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,640 and known hereinafter as Bennett)(newly presented).

As per claim 1, Google teaches a computer implemented method in a data processing system for accessing a database, the computer implemented method comprising (i.e. The Google language tool is a on-line search engine that encompasses the data processing system for accessing a database.)(Page 1): defining a locale ID using a structured query language SET statement (i.e. "Search pages written in: <any language>" The Applicant describes that message tables contain data that are requested by the user on a particular language or locale, see page 14. Therefore, the Examiner equates the value of any language to be locale ID, which is

the value of the user selecting a language option is fixed based on the request, where once the user selects the language option, the computer system is reconfigured based on the corresponding locale.)(Page 1); accessing the database, wherein the database comprises a plurality of message tables (i.e. On page 1, the search page written in: <any language> clearly illustrates that a client requests a cultural context, which is selecting a language from a plurality of cultural contexts, which are many languages contained in the drop-down field. Furthermore, because the Google site is a search engine, an ordinary person skilled in the art understands that a database resides on the back-end that services the Google language tools site.)(Page 1), wherein each message table in the plurality of message tables comprises data in a particular language (i.e. Page 1 and 2 clearly teach that the Google Language site is a search engine that contains a database that contains a plurality of message tables, which are the plurality of languages listed on pages 1 and 2. Furthermore, an ordinary person skilled in the art understands that messages are contained in the plurality of message tables and are provided in the plurality of cultural context.)(Pages 1 and 2); retrieving a locale ID (i.e. "Search pages written in: <any language>" The preceding text clearly indicates that the locale ID, which is the value of the user selecting a language option is also the language ID.)(Page 1), wherein the locale ID is stored in a memory in the data processing system, and wherein the defined locale ID is associated with ones of the message tables in the plurality of message tables wherein the data is represented in the particular language that corresponds with the defined locale ID (i.e. "Search pages written in: <any language>" The preceding text clearly indicates that the locale ID, which is the value of the user selecting a language option is fixed based on the request, where once the user selects the language option, the computer system is reconfigured based on the corresponding locale.)(Page 1); modifying the query by appending the defined locale ID to the table column ID forming a modified query; processing the modified query (Page 1 clearly indicates that the locale is the result of the client selecting pages located in <any country>,

contained in the search for text field would be the targeted text message, and the query is processed when a client selects the Google Search button.)(Page 1).

Google does not explicitly teach wherein the each message table comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID; obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data; and returning the data identified by the modified query, wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned.

Drissi teaches wherein the each message table (i.e. keyword dictionary)(column 3, lines 63-65) comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID (The bi-directional table within the keyword dictionary contains at least one column, with a respective column ID to allow and track translations across a plurality of languages.)(column 3, lines 50-60; column 4, lines 1-10); obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data (obtaining the table column ID is a step that would occur in steps 410-440 in Figure 4, where when a user submits queries, a response to receiving the query for the data occurs when getting search results.)(see Figure 4); and returning the data identified by the modified query (i.e. get search results)(see Figure 4, and at least column 4, lines 28-50), wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned (i.e. "The translated words keywords for the document are stored in an inverted index, which is then used for searching, either in a selected language, a second language or in all languages, as determined by the user.")(Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Google with the teachings of Drissi to include a method wherein the each message table comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID; obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data; and returning the data identified by the modified query, wherein the

data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned with the motivation to avoid the need for translation of the entire document and avoid inaccuracies which may result from translations. (Drissi, Abstract).

Google and Drissi do not explicitly teach defining a locale ID using a structured query language SET statement and table column ID.

Bennett teaches defining a locale ID (i.e. locale ID)(see column 32, lines 24-26; see also Figure 10) using a structured query language SET statement (i.e. SET is a known SQL statement used in query language using SQL Server.)(column 7, lines 28-45; column 18, lines 35-50; column 19, lines 50-70) and table column ID (Figure 10 provides a table, which clearly suggests the use of a table column ID.)(Figure 10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Google with the teachings of Drissi and with the further teachings of Bennett to defining a locale ID using a structured query language SET statement and table column ID with the motivation to avoid the need for translation of the entire document and avoid inaccuracies which may result from translations. (Drissi, Abstract).

As per claim 2, Google teaches a computer implemented method wherein the locale ID comprises at least one of a language, a country, and a time zone (i.e. "Search pages written in: <any language>" "Search pages located in <any country>" The preceding text clearly indicates that at least one language and one country is selected as a cultural context)(Page 1).

As per claim 7, Google teaches a computer implemented method wherein the retrieving step is located in one of a database engine and a command line parser (Page 1 clearly teaches that the Google Language Tool is a database engine that also contains a command line parser, which is the text field contained in the "Search for" field.)(Page 1).

As per claim 8, Google teaches a computer implemented method wherein the locale ID establishes a user environment for implementing sorting, comparing and dating functions by the database engine (i.e. "*Search pages written in: <any language>*" "*Search pages written in: <any language>*" The preceding text clearly indicates that the cultural context can be a language or geographic location.)(Page 1).

As per claim 16, Google teaches a computer readable storage medium storing executable instructions to be executed by a processor comprising (i.e. The Google language tool is an on-line search engine that encompasses the data processing system for accessing a database.)(Page 1); instructions for accessing the database, wherein the database comprises a plurality of message tables (i.e. On page 1, the search page written in: <any language> clearly illustrates that a client requests a cultural context, which is selecting a language from a plurality of cultural contexts, which are many languages contained in the drop-down field. Furthermore, because the Google site is a search engine, an ordinary person skilled in the art understands that a database resides on the back-end that services the Google language tools site.)(Page 1), wherein each message table in the plurality of message tables comprises data in a particular language (i.e. Page 1 and 2 clearly teach that the Google Language site is a search engine that contains a database that contains a plurality of message tables, which are the plurality of languages listed on pages 1 and 2. Furthermore, an ordinary person skilled in the art understands that messages are

contained in the plurality of message tables and are provided in the plurality of cultural context.)(Pages 1 and 2); instructions for retrieving a locale ID (i.e. "Search pages written in: <any language>"" The preceding text clearly indicates that the locale ID, which is the value of the user selecting a language option is also the language ID.)(Page 1), wherein the locale ID is stored in a memory in the data processing system, and wherein the locale ID is defined by a user using a structured query language SET statement (i.e. "Search pages written in: <any language>" The preceding text clearly indicates that the locale ID, which is the value of the user selecting a language option is fixed based on the request, where once the user selects the language option, the computer system is reconfigured based on the corresponding locale.)(Page 1), and wherein the locale ID is associated with ones of the message tables in the plurality of message tables wherein the data is represented in the particular language that corresponds with the locale ID; instructions for modifying the query by appending the locale ID to the table column ID forming a modified query; instructions for processing the modified query (Page 1 clearly indicates that the locale is the result of the client selecting pages located in <any country>, contained in the search for text field would be the targeted text message, and the query is processed when a client selects the Google Search button.)(Page 1).

Google does not explicitly teach wherein the each message table comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID; obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data; and returning the data identified by the modified query, wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned.

Drissi teaches wherein the each message table (i.e. keyword dictionary)(column 3, lines 63-65) comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID (The bi-directional table within the keyword dictionary contains at least one column, with a respective column ID to allow and track

translations across a plurality of languages.)(column 3, lines 50-60; column 4, lines 1-10); obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data (obtaining the table column ID is a step that would occur in steps 410-440 in Figure 4, where when a user submits queries, a response to receiving the query for the data occurs when getting search results.)(see Figure 4); and returning the data identified by the modified query (i.e. get search results)(see Figure 4, and at least column 4, lines 28-50), wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned (i.e. "The translated words keywords for the document are stored in an inverted index, which is then used for searching, either in a selected language, a second language or in all languages, as determined by the user.")(Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Google with the teachings of Drissi to include a method wherein the each message table comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID; obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data; and returning the data identified by the modified query, wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned with the motivation to avoid the need for translation of the entire document and avoid inaccuracies which may result from translations. (Drissi, Abstract).

Google and Drissi do not explicitly teach defining a locale ID using a structured query language SET statement and table column ID.

Bennett teaches defining a locale ID (i.e. locale ID)(see column 32, lines 24-26; see also Figure 10) using a structured query language SET statement (i.e. SET is a known SQL statement used in query language using SQL Server.)(column 7, lines 28-45; column 18, lines 35-50;

column 19, lines 50-70) and table column ID (Figure 10 provides a table, which clearly suggests the use of a table column ID.) (Figure 10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Google with the teachings of Drissi and with the further teachings of Bennett to defining a locale ID using a structured query language SET statement and table column ID with the motivation to avoid the need for translation of the entire document and avoid inaccuracies which may result from translations. (Drissi, Abstract).

As per claim 19, Google teaches a data processing system comprising (i.e. The Google language tool is an on-line search engine that encompasses the data processing system for accessing a database.) (Page 1): the processing unit executes the set of instructions to accessing the database, wherein the database comprises a plurality of message tables (i.e. On page 1, the search page written in: <any language> clearly illustrates that a client requests a cultural context, which is selecting a language from a plurality of cultural contexts, which are many languages contained in the drop-down field. Furthermore, because the Google site is a search engine, an ordinary person skilled in the art understands that a database resides on the back-end that services the Google language tools site.) (Page 1), wherein each message table in the plurality of message tables comprises data in a particular language (i.e. Page 1 and 2 clearly teach that the Google Language site is a search engine that contains a database that contains a plurality of message tables, which are the plurality of languages listed on pages 1 and 2. Furthermore, an ordinary person skilled in the art understands that messages are contained in the plurality of message tables and are provided in the plurality of cultural context.) (Pages 1 and 2); retrieving a locale ID (i.e. "Search pages written in: <any language>" The preceding text clearly indicates that the locale ID, which is the value of the user

selecting a language option is also the language ID.)(Page 1), wherein the locale ID is stored in a memory in the data processing system, and wherein the locale ID is defined by a user using a structured query language SET statement (i.e. "*Search pages written in: <any language>*") The preceding text clearly indicates that the locale ID, which is the value of the user selecting a language option is fixed based on the request, where once the user selects the language option, the computer system is reconfigured based on the corresponding locale.)(Page 1), and wherein the locale ID is associated with ones of the message tables in the plurality of message tables wherein the data is represented in the particular language that corresponds with the locale ID; modifying the query by appending the locale ID to the table column ID forming a modified query; processing the modified query (Page 1 clearly indicates that the locale is the result of the client selecting pages located in <any country>, contained in the search for text field would be the targeted text message, and the query is processed when a client selects the Google Search button.)(Page 1).

Google does not explicitly teach wherein the each message table comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID; obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data; and returning the data identified by the modified query, wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned.

Drissi teaches wherein the each message table (i.e. keyword dictionary)(column 3, lines 63-65) comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID (The bi-directional table within the keyword dictionary contains at least one column, with a respective column ID to allow and track translations across a plurality of languages.)(column 3, lines 50-60; column 4, lines 1-10); obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data (obtaining the table column ID is a step that would occur in steps 410-440 in Figure 4, where when a user submits queries, a response to

receiving the query for the data occurs when getting search results.)(see Figure 4); and returning the data identified by the modified query (i.e. get search results)(see Figure 4, and at least column 4, lines 28-50), wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned (i.e. "The translated words keywords for the document are stored in an inverted index, which is then used for searching, either in a selected language, a second language or in all languages, as determined by the user.")(Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Google with the teachings of Drissi to include a method wherein the each message table comprises at least one column identified by a table column ID; obtaining the table column ID, in response to receiving query for the data; and returning the data identified by the modified query, wherein the data does not correspond with the locale ID is not returned with the motivation to avoid the need for translation of the entire document and avoid inaccuracies which may result from translations. (Drissi, Abstract).

Google and Drissi do not explicitly teach defining a locale ID using a structured query language SET statement and table column ID.

Bennett teaches defining a locale ID (i.e. locale ID)(see column 32, lines 24-26; see also Figure 10) using a structured query language SET statement (i.e. SET is a known SQL statement used in query language using SQL Server.)(column 7, lines 28-45; column 18, lines 35-50; column 19, lines 50-70) and table column ID (Figure 10 provides a table, which clearly suggests the use of a table column ID.)(Figure 10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Google with the teachings of Drissi and

with the further teachings of Bennett to defining a locale ID using a structured query language SET statement and table column ID with the motivation to avoid the need for translation of the entire document and avoid inaccuracies which may result from translations. (Drissi, Abstract).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhan M. Syed whose telephone number is 571-272-7191. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/F. M. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2165

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165